

CUSTOMER NO: 24498  
Serial No. 10/531,742  
Response to OA dtd 7/18/2008  
Response dtd 12/18/08

PATENT  
PF020143

Amendments to the Drawing

The attached three sheets of drawing include the changes to Figures 1, 2 and 3 which have been required by the Examiner. These figures are now designated as prior art.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets 1, 2 and 3

**Remarks/Arguments**

In order to overcome the Examiner's objections to the drawing, Figures 1, 2 and 3 have been labeled as prior art. The Applicant submits that the Examiner's objections to the drawing are thereby overcome.

In order to more clearly define the invention, Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 9 have been amended. Claims 3, 6, 7, 8 and 10 have been canceled.

This invention relates to a multiple output conversion unit with communications means, consisting of filters, in order to allow a communication channel between different outputs of decoders connected to a switching device in a distribution network.

The Examiner has cited WO 02/065780 to Antoine et al, and EP 1024613 to Watanaba et al. The Applicant submits that neither of the cited references affects the patentability of the instant Claims as amended.

Neither of the cited references show or suggest:

“at least one filter linking the signal input/outputs between them, in a communication frequency band”

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended. Nowhere do any of the figures of Antoine et al show or suggest this structure.

Antoine et al shows a system for switching multiple broadcast signals from satellite antennas for transmission through a single coaxial cable to television receivers, while managing use of the broadcast signals through telephony signal insertion. Thus, telephony signal and RF signals are incorporated on a single coaxial cable.

The multi-switch and telephony interface of Antoine et al route telephony information to the receiver either using a triplexer or operates with a multi-switch and with a triplexer for providing multiple broadcast signals and telephony information to

the receiver. Nowhere does Antoine et al. disclose or suggest connections between the different outputs of the multi-switch or the interface or of the triplexer, permitting communications between the different receivers.

The Examiner considers the paragraph on page 16, lines 24-31, to disclose that means of communication link the inputs/outputs between them in a communication frequency band. The applicant can not agree. This paragraph is related to hybrid device 100 which controls the operation of system 10. See page 14, line 4.

In Antoine et al., one hybrid on each side of the coax cable 18 allows simultaneous transmission of two analog telephony audio signals, and two digital signals. See page 14, lines 13-20. The hybrid device has a digital input, digital output and analog input and analog output, and can multiplex analog and digital signals onto a single conductor of the coaxial cable 18 joining the triplexer and the multi-switch. See page 16, lines 5-7. In the triplexer, the switch matrix allows the analog input/output from either the DAA or the SLIC (FIG 3A) to be routed to the “hybrid of the triplexer” for transmission over the coax cable to the “hybrid of the multi-switch”. In the multi-switch, a switch matrix allows any analog input/output combination from any hybrid to be connected to any other analog input/output to other hybrid, and then need to the SLIC or DAA in any other triplexer. Thus, the analog signals from a triplexer are transmitted via the switch matrix of the multi-switch to another triplexer. Nowhere are the signals transmitted via a filter, as recited in Claim 1.

Similarly, nowhere does Antoine et al show or suggest:

“a device comprising at least one filter, linking the inputs/outputs between them, in a communication frequency band”

as specifically recited in Claim 9 as amended.

It is therefore clear that Antoine et al. does not affect the patentability of either Claim 1 or Claim 9 as amended.

Watanaba et al show multiple outputs 6a and 6b, but do not link them together with a filter, as recited in Claims 1 and 9 as amended. It is therefore clear that

CUSTOMER NO: 24498  
Serial No. 10/531,742  
Response to OA dtd 7/18/2008  
Response dtd 12/18/08

PATENT  
PF020143

Watanaba et al does not affect the patentability of either Claim 1 or Claim 9 as amended.

In fact, it is clear that Antoine et al and Watanaba et al, taken either singly or in combination, do not affect the patentability of either Claim 1 or Claim 9 as amended.

Claims 2, 4 and 5 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

The Applicant therefore submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Raoul Monnier

by /Daniel E. Sragow/  
Daniel E. Sragow, Attorney  
Reg. No. 22,856  
(609) 734-6832

Patent Operation  
THOMSON Licensing LLC  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Dated: 121808